



## **JEFFERSON PARK EXPANSION** **PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING #4**

**Thursday, January 19, 2006**  
Jefferson Lawn Bowling Clubhouse

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

**PAT Members Present:** Bruce Bentley                      Shellwyn Badger  
Mira Latoszek    Mike Carney  
Monique Cherrier    Steve Galey  
Stuart McFeely    Nancy Spurgeon

**PAT Members Absent:** Bert Caoili

**Other attendees:** Randy Smith, Jefferson Community Center Coordinator  
Randy Robinson, Project Manager  
Greg Brower, Andy Mitton, The Berger Partnership

**Meeting Facilitator:** Cheryl Fraser, Parks South Resource Manager

**Welcome:** The PAT sign-in sheet and guest sign-in sheet was circulated and signed.

**Role of PAT:** Cheryl mentioned the overall role of the PAT is to make recommendations to Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds.

**Future meeting dates were given:**

- February 4, 2006, 10-2, Jefferson Park Expansion Schematic Design Open House at Jefferson Community Center
- February 23, 2006, 6:00 PM, Seattle Parks Board Public Hearing on Jefferson Park Expansion Schematic Design at Seattle Parks headquarters at 100 Dexter Ave.
- March 16, 2006, 6:30 PM, Jefferson Project Advisory Team Meeting at Jefferson Park Lawn Bowling Clubhouse

**Guest Comments:** Guest comments were received by 14 guests:  
**Larry McCann** said that synthetic fields should have lighting. He believes that lighting should be over the reservoir. He thinks the Park plan is flawed. He asked for a show of hands of people who are here for the lights - 18 adults raised their hands in the room and a few kids in the hallway.  
**Kelly Warner-King** said that lights on field by the community center would be good for kids and adults, too.  
**Placentio** said that soccer for kids would be good.  
**Erin Fanning** said that lights on field would not impact much but would show the diversity of the community.  
**Melicent Whinston** thought that if so much money would be spent, then the soccer field should have lights. The soccer practices get dark too soon.  
**Todd** – thinks soccer fields is a good idea, there will be a lot more kids in the neighborhood in coming years.  
**Mary Cruz** wants lights for soccer to improve practices and safety. Kids should be able to walk or ride bikes to games.  
**Christine** wants lit soccer field so kids could walk to the field. Driving range is lit already. Wants swimming pool at Jefferson.

**Judi Johnson** wants lit soccer fields for her kids. Doesn't want kids to have to play in the dark. Get kids off Nitendo, TV and off the streets.

**Erin Brannan** is in favor of soccer field my Mercer Middle School but does not want a lit field over the reservoir in the view area.

**Steve Wickman** is an advocate for kids but the plan already has a lit soccer field. He doesn't feel that it should be in the middle of the park – view.

**Julie Cain** is researching funding sources – cannot get funding for lights without synthetic surface. Lights would help with safety.

**Mark Holland** said that lighted soccer field already exists on the plan. We should stick to the plan which was a good compromise.

**Paul Gearhart** has a concern for Olmsted legacy. Lights will affect the aesthetics, glare, noise, parking, etc.

**Previous Meeting Notes:** Meeting notes from 11/19/05 were approved with no corrections by PAT members. Two PAT members received a copy for further review.

**Project Progress Report:** **Randy R.** gave an update on the project schedule: Schematic Design completes tonight and Design Development begins. Design Development will conclude this summer and the project will move into Construction Documents in the summer 2006 to early 2007. Construction will last two years: 2007 and 2008.

The goal for tonight's meeting is to bring closure to Schematic Design by approving the design plan and moving into some tasks related to Design Development.

**Schematic Design:** **Greg Brower** described the condition that SPU will leave the site when they turn it over to Seattle Parks. Greg then explored the Schematic Design elements that have been revised as part of the meetings in December including the Seattle Design Commission and the Dec. 15, 2005 public meeting. Design Plan shows \$30 million worth of improvements. Greg reviewed all of the major features of the Schematic Design including: the north meadow (reflects Olmsted legacy), plaza, play area, lawn areas, water features, ball fields, pathways, etc.

**Schematic Design Discussion** **Steve Galey** said that there is a need for another baseball field (maybe 60' base path). The plan should have two baseball fields. His experience at Seattle high schools has been that new lighting technology has improved and now there is very little light spill over. He thought all of the water features would be storm water for environmental reasons. Do the small water features use potable water. Yes (Greg).

**Randy R.** mentioned that in Design Development which water features would be funded and which would not be funded will be clarified. Even elements that are not funded should stay on the Schematic Design Plan as place holders for the future.

**Mira** clarified that regarding lighting, the plan already shows a lighted athletic field at Jefferson Playfield. She asked Randy to verify.

**Randy R.** stated that Jefferson Playfield has always included synthetic turf and lights from the 2002 plan up through our current Schematic Design. As for funding of the reservoir lid: SPU is budgeting for dirt and grass seed. Synthetic turf over the reservoir is still an idea, a hope, a dream. In our current budget we cannot afford to install synthetic turf without taking away from other areas of the park. With several acres of new park land to

develop we can't just leave a hole in the ground and direct project funds to the synthetic turf over the reservoir.

**Mira** presented a map showing the locations of existing, funded, and proposed athletic field lighted sites in the city with several south east locations including Maplewood on south Beacon Hill. Map included some of the Seattle School District sites.

**Mike** complained that the map was inaccurate.

**Bruce** indicated that it showed the picture pretty well even though a few sites were left out.

**Cheryl** mentioned that she could bring an updated plan that showed more locations for lighted fields.

**Mike** commented that the improvements, including lighting at Jefferson Playfield (by Mercer Middle School) are not good for three reasons: 1) neighbors on 16<sup>th</sup> Ave will be impacted by lights, 2) Samoan Cricket would be impacted because you're not supposed to eat food on synthetic turf but the Samoans have big picnics at their games, 3) Cricket pitch (concrete) is in the way of using the field for soccer – this issue has not been resolved. Samoan group and baseball groups interests should be considered at Jefferson Playfield. He wants lights over the reservoir and stated that if anyone wants dark open space they can have that at the golf course at night. The golf course is mostly used by people outside Beacon Hill (outside interests).

**Randy Smith** feels that two baseball fields would be needed on top of the reservoir (vs. one field shown). The Jefferson Community Center Advisory Council supports: the play area where it is at with lighting, a soccer field with lighting, a baseball/softball field with no lighting. Randy S. submitted minutes from the Advisory Council meeting to Randy R.

**Stuart** took issue with Mike's comment about golf consisting of outside interests. He said golf has widespread support on Beacon Hill. Stuart felt that fill is expensive and that fill should be minimized in the north meadow area. Active water features are expensive and we should use the money for other things. We need all of the money we can to make the park a reality. Natural grass over the reservoir is a mistake, it should be synthetic. Community Terrace (plaza) is expensive and is being embellished by the Berger Partnership. Active water features should not take away from other areas of the park. Make the basic parts work.

**Shellwyn** echoed Stuarts comments. The whole park needs to get done before the special features.

**Bruce** believes that the whole park should be completed. Synthetic turf over the reservoir is good, lights are needed too.

**Nancy** would like synthetic turf over the reservoir. Lighting technology has improved. Young children are important, has the play area moved?

**Greg** responded that the play area had moved from the 2002 plan back into open areas to the north.

**Mike** mentioned that he does not support synthetic and lighting at Jefferson Playfield and would like his dissent noted in the minutes.

**Mira** supports lighting at Jefferson Playfield.

**Randy R.** brought a close to the discussion about Schematic Design by stating that even though we seem to have consensus for the plan in general he didn't think we full consensus on the issue of lighting on top of the reservoir. This issue was a stumbling block to finalizing the Schematic Design and would have to be decided by the Parks Board on February 23<sup>rd</sup>.

**Randy** then asked if that was the only issue that was contentious and **Mike** responded that he wants to go on record of not approving of the synthetic turf and lights at Jefferson Playfield.

**Introduction to Design Development:**

**Greg** started the discussion of Design Development by displaying the “cut-out” plan that shows the general area of the park that will be the areas that advance into Design Development – generally the central, northern, and northeastern areas of the park.

Greg then connected the Vision Statements from previous meetings to the physical development of the site in Design Development. There will be three areas for detailed discussion that were shown as detail plans:

North Meadow, Sports Plateau, and Northeast Corner (incl. play area, plaza, tennis, entry, etc.). A homework assignment was distributed to each PAT member to be worked on and brought to the next PAT meeting. The assignment was to look closely at the specific use areas in the plan and identify activities and attributes that will make the space important and successful – take pictures, sketches, or write down ideas.

Several PAT members asked for copies of the plan that was on display showing the areas.

**Conclusion:**

**Randy** concluded the meeting by stating that he would provide each PAT member with plans in .pdf format. Also, the next PAT meeting was very important because we would break up into sub-groups to study specific areas in detail. Please everyone (all PAT members) come to the next PAT meeting.

**Next meeting:**

Next PAT meeting is March 16, 2006.

Open House is Feb. 4<sup>th</sup> at the community center 10 am - 2 pm.

Parks Board Meeting is February 23, 2006 at the Parks headquarters building at 100 Dexter.

**Meeting Summary By:**

rfr

**Additional Information is Available:**

- Park web site: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/JeffersonPark.htm>
- Randy Robinson, Seattle Parks Project Manager, (206) 684-7035; [randy.robinson@seattle.gov](mailto:randy.robinson@seattle.gov)
- Cheryl Fraser, Parks Resources Manager, (206) 684-8016; [cheryl.fraser@seattle.gov](mailto:cheryl.fraser@seattle.gov)